APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/394,590	09/13/1999	DANIEL PAUL BURTON	26530.3	4471

27683   7590   08/08/2002

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100
DALLAS, TX 75202

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, THU HA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	7

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/394,590	BURTON ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thu Ha T. Nguyen	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 May 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer

et al. et al U.S. Patent No. 6,289,378 in view of Dillingham U.S. Patent No.

6,327,608.

2. In reference to claims 1 and 12, Meyer et al. et al. discloses a method for

manipulating objects by using Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning

protocol, wherein the protocol allows a user to perform remote web content

authoring operations, the method comprising:

    a. receiving a request using the protocol for a manipulation of a first network

       object from a requesting user, wherein the first network object includes at

       least one from the groups consisting of: devices, resources and container

       objects (abstract, figures 1, 3A Item 305, col. 3 lines 26-col. 4 lines 21);

    b. verifying a first set of authorization information (Figure 3A Item 310);

    c. checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user

       (Figure 3A Item 340);

> d. verifying a username and a password for the requesting user (Figure 3A
>   Item 342);
>
> e. determining an object type for the first network object (Figure 3A Items
>   382-384); and
>
> f. sending a response to the requesting user (Figure 3B Item 390).

Meyer et al. et al. discloses the HTTP Response but does not disclose the translation
from logical to physical location. However, Dillingham disclose steps of translating a
logical object address to a physical file system path (Col. 8 lines 33-55); and checking a
file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user including determining
whether the first network object is a network object (Figure 4 Item 220). It would have
been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to
modify the method as disclosed by Meyer et al. et al. to include the translation as
disclosed by Dillingham because the translation system will eliminate the need for the
remote administrator to remember the entire path and exact name of the file on the
server (Col. 1 lines 54-67). Furthermore, Dillingham teaches that this translation system
prevents the inability to browse the server's physical files and directories from a remote
computer over the Internet.

Furthermore, Meyer et al. et al. discloses checking a file system for validity and
authorization for the requesting user. Meyer et al. et al. does not expressly include
determining whether the first network object is a network object. However, this feature

is deemed to be inherent from the Meyer et al. et al. system as Col. 5 lines 20-32

teaches that the administration can browse and select a number of network objects and

its respective identification information. Therefore, the object must be verified to

determine whether the requested/selected object is that first object before identification

information is displayed.

3. In reference to claim 23, Meyer et al. et al. discloses a system for manipulating

network objects by using Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol,

wherein the protocol allows a user to perform remote web content authoring

operations, the system comprising:

a. a web server (Figure 1 Item 116);

b. a work station connected to the web server by an Internet connection

(Figure 1 Items 102-108);

c. at least one network server connected to the web server (Col. 3 lines 40-

45);

d. at least one storage system connected to the web server (Figure 1 Item

112);

e. means for receiving a request using the protocol for a manipulation of a

first network object from the work station, wherein the first network object

includes at least one from the group consisting of devices, resources and

container objects (abstract, figures 1, 3A Item 305, col. 3 lines 25-col. 4

lines 21) ;

   f. means for verifying a first set of authorization information (Figure 3A Item

310);

   g. means for checking for validity and authorization for a requesting user

(Figure 3A Item 340)

   h. means for verifying a username and a password for the requesting user

(Figure 3A Item 342) ;

   i. means for determining an object type for the first network object (Figure

3A Item 382 and 384) ; and

   j. means for sending a response to the requesting user (Figure 3B Item

390).

Meyer et al. et al. discloses the HTTP Response but does not disclose the means for

translating a logical Uniform Resource Locator to the storage system. However,

Dillingham disclose steps of translating logical Uniform Resource Locator to the storage

system (Col. 8 lines 33-55); and checking a file system for validity and authorization for

the requesting user including determining whether the first network object is a network

object (Figure 4 Item 220). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer et al. et

al. to include the translation as disclosed by Dillingham because the translation system

will eliminate the need for the remote administrator to remember the entire path and

exact name of the file on the server (Col. 1 lines 54-67). Furthermore, Dillingham teaches that this translation system prevents the inability to browse the server's physical files and directories from a remote computer over the Internet.

Furthermore, Meyer et al. et al. discloses checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user. Meyer et al. et al. does not expressly include determining whether the first network object is a network object. However, this feature is deemed to be inherent from the Meyer et al. et al. system as Col. 5 lines 20-32 teaches that the administration can browse and select a number of network objects and its respective identification information. Therefore, the object must be verified to determine whether the requested/selected object is that first object before identification information is displayed.

4. In reference to claim 34, Meyer et al. et al. discloses a method for manipulating network objects by using Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, wherein the protocol allows a user to perform remote web content authoring operations, the method comprising:

 a. receiving a request using the protocol for a manipulation of a first network object from a requesting user (abstract, figures 1, 3A Item 305, col. 3 lines 25-col. 4 lines 21);

 b. verifying a first set of authorization information (Figure 3A Item 310);

c. checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting

user, wherein the first network object includes at least one from the group

consisting of: devices, resources and container objects (Figure 3A Item

340);

d. verifying a username and a password for the requesting user (Figure 3A

Item 342);

e. returning a first error message if requesting user is unauthorized to access

the first network object (Figure 3A Item 346);

f. determining an object type for the first network object (Figure 3A Item 382

and 384)

g. sending a response to the requesting user (Figure 3B Item 390);

h. navigating a context menu for a plurality of screens that allow modification

of the set of attributes of the first network object (Figure 5 and 6); and

i. modifying a set of attributes of the first network object by modifying a set

of fields on a screen of a subset of the set of attributes (Figure 6 and 7).

Meyer et al. et al. discloses the HTTP Response but does not disclose the means for

translating a logical object address to a physical file system path. However, Dillingham

disclose steps of translating logical object address to a physical file system path (Col. 8

lines 33-55); and checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting

user including determining whether the first network object is a network object (Figure 4

Item 220). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer et al. et al. to include the translation as disclosed by Dillingham because the translation system will eliminate the need for the remote administrator to remember the entire path and exact name of the file on the server (Col. 1 lines 54-67). Furthermore, Dillingham teaches that this translation system prevents the inability to browse the server's physical files and directories from a remote computer over the Internet.

Furthermore, Meyer et al. et al. discloses checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user. Meyer et al. et al. does not expressly include determining whether the first network object is a network object. However, this feature is deemed to be inherent from the Meyer et al. et al. system as Col. 5 lines 20-32 teaches that the administration can browse and select a number of network objects and its respective identification information. Therefore, the object must be verified to determine whether the requested/selected object is that first object before identification information is displayed.

5. In reference to claim 40, Meyer et al. et al. discloses a computer network for a plurality of users to access a workplace by using Internet authoring, collaboration and versioning protocol, wherein the protocol allows user to perform remote web content authoring operations, the system comprising:

    a. a plurality of network computer servers within the computer network (Col. 3 lines 40-45);

   b. a plurality of network computer workstations within the computer network

   and connected to at least one of the plurality of network computer servers

   (Figure 1 Items 102 -108);

   c. a file system, network directory, and printing subsystem on the computer

   network and accessible by the plurality of users by the protocol (Figure 2

   Item 215);

   d. a security system that provides an authentication process in order to allow

   access to the plurality of users to the file system, network directory, and

   printing subsystem (Figure 3A); and

   e. a graphical user interface using the protocol for viewing the file system,

   network directory and printing subsystem as the workplace, and providing

   the plurality of users the ability to manipulate the file system, network

   directory and printing subsystem and the ability to run a plurality of

   network applications within the file system and network directory portions

   of the subsystem (Abstract and Figure 5).

6. In reference to claim 2, 22, and 33, Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham together

   discloses method of claim 1, 12, and 23. Further Meyer et al. et al. discloses

   wherein the manipulation of the first network object includes changing a set of

   attributes of the first network object (Col. 6 lines 1-22).

7. In reference to claim 3, 13, and 24, Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham together discloses the method of claim 1, 12 and 23. Meyer et al. et al. does not disclose verifying that the first object is found. However, Dillingham discloses a step of verifying that the first network object is found (Col. 5 lines 51-55 and Figure 3 Item 112-114 and Figure 4 Item 220-222). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer et al. et al. to include the verification because proper error trapping offers an extra layer of verification thereby resulting in a more efficient and robust system.

8. In reference to claim 4, 14, and 25, Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham together discloses the method of claim 3, 13, 24. Meyer et al. et al. does not disclose the step of returning a second error message if the first network object is not found. However, Dillingham discloses the step of returning a second error message if the first network object is not found. (Col. 7 lines 59-65 and Figure 4 Item 220-222). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer et al. et al. to include the second error message because proper error trapping offers an extra layer of verification. More importantly, the error message provides informational feedback for the user.

9. In reference to claim 10, 20, and 31, Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham together

    discloses the method of claim 1, 12, and 23. Meyer et al. et al. further includes

    modifying a set of attributes of the first network object by modifying a set of fields on

    a screen of a subset of the set of attributes (Figure Col. 6 lines 20-59 and Figure 6).

10. In reference to claim 11, 21 and 33, Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham together

    discloses the method of claim 10, 20, and 31. Meyer et al. et al. further includes

    navigating a context menu for a plurality of screens that allow modification of the set

    of attributes of the first network object (Figure 5).

11. In reference to claim 41, Meyer et al. et al. discloses the computer network of claim

    40 wherein the computer network is a global Internet network and the file and

    directory subsystem is within an intranet network (Figure 1).

12. In reference to claim 42, Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham together discloses the

    computer network of claim 40. Meyer et al. et al. further teaches where the

    graphical user interface is a web browser (Abstract).

13. Claims 5-6, 15-16, 26-27, and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

    unpatentable over Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham as applied to claim 1, 12, 23,

    and 34 above, and further in view of Shrader et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,195,097.

14. In reference to claim 5, 15, 26, and 35, Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham together
discloses the method of claim 1, 12, 23, and 34. Meyer et al. et al. discloses a
variety of activities performed through the web browser including file system
browsing, process viewing and modifications of network objects (Col. 6 lines 1-22).
Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham both does not disclose assigning new rights to the
first network object. However, Shrader et al. discloses a web-based distributed
computing environment to administer and manage computer resources. Shrader et
al. also disclose that network administrators can modify the security attributes, such
as system privileges, of an object (Col. 4 lines 5-21). Therefore, it would have been
obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to
modify the method as disclosed by Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham to include the
feature of assigning new rights to the first network object because assigning user's
rights is a network administrative task similar to file system browsing and process
viewing. The need for network administrator to configuring network objects easily,
securely and quickly from a remote secure web browser is just as important as for
an administrator to assign user's rights.

15. In reference to claim 6, 16, 27 and 36, Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham together
discloses the method of claim 5, 15, 26, and 35. Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham
does not disclose wherein the new rights for the first network object are for a second
network object. However, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that two
objects can have the same set of rights. Two objects can be configured with the

same security privileges using the Shrader et al. system. Therefore, claim 6, 16, 27, and 36 are rejected until the same rationale as claims 5, 15, 26 and 35.

16. Claims 7-9, 17-19, 28-30, and 37-39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham and Shrader et al. as applied to claims 5, 7, 15, 17, 26, 27, 35, and 37 above and further in view of Smith II et al U.S. Patent No. 5,884,298.

17. In reference to claim 7, 17, 28, and 37, Meyer et al. et al., Dillingham and Shrader et al. together discloses the method of claim 5, 15, 26, and 35. However, Meyer et al. et al., Dillingham and Shrader et al. together does not disclose wherein the new rights are assigned by dragging and dropping a second network object on the first network object by the use of an interactive computer screen.

Official notice is taken that the drag and drop feature to assign the properties of one object to another is well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

18. In reference to claim 8, 18, 29, and 38, Meyer et al. et al., Dillingham, and Shrader et al. together discloses the method of claim 7, 17, 27, and 37. However, Meyer et al. et al., Dillingham, and Shrader et al. does not disclose wherein the new rights are all rights for all users and assigned by dragging a public icon and dropping the public

icon on the first network object. Smith II et al. discloses the method of manipulating

objects by dragging and dropping icons, icons being associated with the objects

(Abstract). Smith II et al. also discloses a hierarchical index to a user with a private

CD Exchanger and a Network Access CD Exchanger. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

modify the system disclosed by Meyer et al. et al., Dillingham, and Shrader et al.

together to drag and drop the public icon on the first network object to assign users

rights because the drag and drop feature is known in the art to associate properties

with one another (Col. 20 lines 14-15).

19. In reference to claim 9, 19, 30, and 39, Meyer et al. et al. and Dillingham together

discloses the method of claim 7, 17, 27, and 37. However, Meyer et al. et al.,

Dillingham, and Shrader et al. does not disclose wherein the new rights are

subtracting all rights for all users except an assigned user to the first network object

and wherein the new rights are assigned by dragging a private icon and dropping the

private icon on the first network object. Smith II et al. discloses the method of

manipulating objects by dragging and dropping icons, icons being associated with

the objects (Abstract). Smith II et al. also discloses a hierarchical index to a user

with a private CD Exchanger and a Network Access CD Exchanger. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the system disclosed by Meyer et al. et al., Dillingham, and

Shrader et al. together to drag and drop the private icon on the first network object to

assign users rights because the drag and drop feature is known in the art to

associate properties with one another (Col. 20 lines 14-15).

20. Claims 12-21 and 23-32 have similar limitations as claims 1-11; therefore, they are

rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed May 30, 2002 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Applicants argue that neither Meyer et al. nor Dillingham teach or suggest the present

invention as recited by claim 1, 12, 23, 34 and 40. In response to applicants' argument,

Examiner concludes that Meyer et al. in combination with Dillingham do teach and

suggest a method for manipulating objects by using Internet authoring, collaboration

and versioning protocol, wherein the protocol allows a user to perform remote web

content authoring operations, the method comprising: receiving a request using the

protocol for a manipulation of a first network object from a requesting user, wherein the

first network object includes at least one from the groups consisting of: devices,

resources and container objects; verifying a first set of authorization information;

checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user; verifying a

username and a password for the requesting user; determining an object type for the

first network object; and sending a response to the requesting user (abstract, figures 1,

3A-B, col. 3 lines 26-col. 4 lines 55). Meyer et al. et al. discloses the HTTP Response

but does not disclose the translation from logical to physical location. However, Dillingham disclose steps of translating a logical object address to a physical file system path (Col. 8 lines 33-55); and checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user including determining whether the first network object is a network object (Figure 4 Item 220). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as disclosed by Meyer et al. et al. to include the translation as disclosed by Dillingham because the translation system will eliminate the need for the remote administrator to remember the entire path and exact name of the file on the server (Col. 1 lines 54-67). Furthermore, Dillingham teaches that this translation system prevents the inability to browse the server's physical files and directories from a remote computer over the Internet.

Furthermore, Meyer et al. et al. discloses checking a file system for validity and authorization for the requesting user. Meyer et al. et al. does not expressly include determining whether the first network object is a network object. However, this feature is deemed to be inherent from the Meyer et al. et al. system as Col. 5 lines 20-32 teaches that the administration can browse and select a number of network objects and its respective identification information. Therefore, the object must be verified to determine whether the requested/selected object is that first object before identification information is displayed.

Furthermore, in response to applicants' arguments, the recitation that Meyer et al. et al., Dillinham, Shrader et al., and Smith II do not teach or suggest the method, system of manipulating network objects by using Internet authorizing, collaboration and

versioning protocol, has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/394,590   Page 18
Art Unit: 2155

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ThuHa Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-

7447. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30am-5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7201

for regular communications and 703-305-7201 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

ThuHa Nguyen
August 6, 2002

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100